arXiv:1608.07708v2 [cs.LO] 30 Aug 2016

Logic programming: laxness and saturation[☆]

Ekaterina Komendantskaya[*]

Department of Computer Science, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK

John Power

Department of Computer Science, University of Bath, BA2 7AY, UK

Abstract

A propositional logic program P may be identified with a $P_f P_f$-coalgebra on the set of atomic propositions in the program. The corresponding $C(P_f P_f)$-coalgebra, where $C(P_f P_f)$ is the cofree comonad on $P_f P_f$, describes derivations by resolution. That correspondence has been developed to model first-order programs in two ways, with lax semantics and saturated semantics, based on locally ordered categories and right Kan extensions respectively. We unify the two approaches, exhibiting them as complementary rather than competing, reflecting the theorem-proving and proof-search aspects of logic programming. While maintaining that unity, we further refine lax semantics to give finitary models of logic progams with existential variables, and to develop a precise semantic relationship between variables in logic programming and worlds in local state.

Keywords: Logic programming, coalgebra, coinductive derivation tree, Lawvere theories, lax transformations, saturation

1. Introduction

Over recent years, there has been a surge of interest in category theoretic semantics of logic programming. Research has focused on two ideas: lax semantics, proposed by the current authors and collaborators [1], and saturated semantics, proposed by Bonchi and Zanasi [2]. Both ideas are based on coalgebra, agreeing on variable-free logic programs. Both ideas use subtle, well-established category theory, associated with locally ordered categories and with right Kan extensions respectively [3]. And both elegantly clarify and extend established logic programming constructs and traditions, for instance [4] and [5].

[☆]No data was generated in the course of this research.

[*]Corresponding author

Email addresses: ek19@hw.ac.uk (Ekaterina Komendantskaya), A.J.Power@bath.ac.uk (John Power)

Until now, the two ideas have been presented as alternatives, competing with each other rather than complementing each other. A central thesis of this paper is that the competition is illusory, the two ideas being two views of a single, elegant body of theory, those views reflecting different but complementary aspects of logic programming, those aspects broadly corresponding with the notions of theorem proving and proof search. Such reconciliation has substantial consequences. In particular, it means that whenever one further refines one approach, as we shall do to the original lax approach in two substantial ways here, one should test whether the proposed refinement also applies to the other approach, and see what consequences it has from the latter perspective.

The category theoretic basis for both lax and saturated semantics is as follows. It has long been observed, e.g., in [6, 7], that logic programs induce coalgebras, allowing coalgebraic modelling of their operational semantics. Using the definition of logic program in Lloyd's book [8], given a set of atoms At, one can identify a variable-free logic program P built over At with a $P_f P_f$-coalgebra structure on At, where P_f is the finite powerset functor on Set: each atom is the head of finitely many clauses in P, and the body of each clause contains finitely many atoms. It was shown in [9] that if $C(P_f P_f)$ is the cofree comonad on $P_f P_f$, then, given a logic program P qua $P_f P_f$-coalgebra, the corresponding $C(P_f P_f)$-coalgebra structure characterises the and-or derivation trees generated by P, cf. [4]. That fact has formed the basis for our work on lax semantics [1, 10, 11, 12, 13] and for Bonchi and Zanasi's work on saturation semantics [14, 2].

In attempting to extend the analysis to arbitrary logic programs, both groups followed the tradition of [15, 6, 5, 16]: given a signature Σ of function symbols, let $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ denote the Lawvere theory generated by Σ, and, given a logic program P with function symbols in Σ, consider the functor category $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$, extending the set At of atoms in a variable-free logic program to the functor from $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}$ to Set sending a natural number n to the set $At(n)$ of atomic formulae with at most n variables generated by the function symbols in Σ and the predicate symbols in P. We all sought to model P by a $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, P_f P_f]$-coalgebra $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ that, at n, takes an atomic formula $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with at most n variables, considers all substitutions of clauses in P into clauses with variables among $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ whose head agrees with $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, and gives the set of sets of atomic formulae in antecedents, naturally extending the construction for variable-free logic programs. However, that idea is too simple for two reasons. We all dealt with the second problem in the same way, so we shall discuss it later, but the first problem is illustrated by the following example.

Example 1. *ListNat (for lists of natural numbers) denotes the logic program*
1. $\texttt{nat(0)} \leftarrow$
2. $\texttt{nat(s(x))} \leftarrow \texttt{nat(x)}$
3. $\texttt{list(nil)} \leftarrow$
4. $\texttt{list(cons(x, y))} \leftarrow \texttt{nat(x)}, \texttt{list(y)}$

ListNat has nullary function symbols `0` *and* `nil`*, a unary function symbol* `s`*,*

and a binary function symbol `cons`*. So the signature* Σ *of ListNat contains four elements.*

There is a map in $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ *of the form* $0 \to 1$ *that models the nullary function symbol* 0*. So, naturality of the map* $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ *in* $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$ *would yield commutativity of the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} At(1) & \xrightarrow{p_1} & P_f P_f At(1) \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle At(\mathtt{0})} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle P_f P_f At(\mathtt{0})} \\ At(0) & \xrightarrow[p_0]{} & P_f P_f At(0) \end{array}$$

But consider $\mathtt{nat(x)} \in At(1)$*: there is no clause of the form* $\mathtt{nat(x)} \leftarrow$ *in ListNat, so commutativity of the diagram would imply that there cannot be a clause in ListNat of the form* $\mathtt{nat(0)} \leftarrow$ *either, but in fact there is one. Thus p is not a map in the functor category* $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$*.*

Proposed resolutions diverged: at CALCO in 2011, we proposed lax transformations [17], then at CALCO 2013, Bonchi and Zanasi proposed saturation semantics [14]. First we shall describe our approach.

Our approach was to relax the naturality condition on p to a subset condition, following [18, 19, 20], so that, given a map in $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ of the form $f : n \to m$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} At(m) & \xrightarrow{p_m} & P_f P_f At(m) \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle At(f)} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle P_f P_f At(f)} \\ At(n) & \xrightarrow[p_n]{} & P_f P_f At(n) \end{array}$$

need not commute, but rather the composite via $P_f P_f At(m)$ need only yield a subset of that via $At(n)$. So, for example, $p_1(\mathtt{nat(x)})$ could be the empty set while $p_0(\mathtt{nat(0)})$ could be non-empty in the semantics for ListNat as required. We extended *Set* to *Poset* in order to express such laxness, and we adopted established category theoretic research on laxness, notably that of [20], in order to prove that a cofree comonad exists and, on programs such as ListNat, behaves as we wish. This agrees with, and is indeed an instance of, He Jifeng and Tony Hoare's use of laxness to model data refinement [21, 22, 23, 24].

Bonchi and Zanasi's approach was to use saturation semantics [14, 2], following [6]. The key category theoretic result that supports it asserts that, regarding $ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)$, equally $ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op}$, as a discrete category with inclusion functor $I : ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_\Sigma$, the functor

$$[I, Set] : [\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set] \longrightarrow [ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op}, Set]$$

that sends $H : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Set$ to the composite $HI : ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op} \longrightarrow Set$ has a right adjoint, given by right Kan extension. The data for $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$, although not forming a map in $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$, may be seen as a map in $[ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op}, Set]$. So, by the adjointness, the data for p corresponds to a map $\bar{p} : At \longrightarrow R(P_f P_f AtI)$ in $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$, thus to a coalgebra on At in $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$, where $R(P_f P_f AtI)$ is the right Kan extension of $P_f P_f AtI$ along the inclusion I. The right Kan extension is defined by

$$R(P_f P_f AtI)(n) = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{L}_\Sigma} (P_f P_f At(m))^{\mathcal{L}_\Sigma(m,n)}$$

and the function

$$\bar{p}(n) : At(n) \longrightarrow \prod_{m \in \mathcal{L}_\Sigma} (P_f P_f At(m))^{\mathcal{L}_\Sigma(m,n)}$$

takes an atomic formula $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, and, for every substitution for $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ generated by the signature Σ, gives the set of sets of atomic formulae in the tails of clauses with head $A(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, where the t_i's are determined by the substitution. By construction, $\bar{p}$ is natural, but one quantifies over all possible substitutions for $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in order to obtain that naturality, and one ignores the laxness of p.

As we shall show in Section 5, the two approaches can be unified. If one replaces

$$[I, Set] : [\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set] \longrightarrow [ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op}, Set]$$

by the inclusion

$$[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset] \longrightarrow Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$$

$[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$ being a full subcategory of $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset]$, one obtains exactly Bonchi and Zanasi's correspondence between p and $\bar{p}$, with exactly the same formula, starting from lax transformations as we proposed. Thus, from a category theoretic perspective, saturation can be seen as complementary to laxness rather than as an alternative to it. This provides a robustness test for future refinements to models of logic programming: a refinement of one view of category theoretic semantics can be tested by its effect on the other. We now turn to such refinements.

Recently, we have refined lax semantics in two substantial ways, the first of which was the focus of the workshop paper [25] that this paper extends, and the second of which we introduce here. For the first, a central contribution of lax semantics has been the inspiration it provided towards the development of an efficient logic programming algorithm [1, 10, 11, 12, 13]. That development drew our attention to the semantic significance of *existential* variables: such variables do not appear in ListNat, and they are not needed for a considerable body of logic programming, but they do appear in logic programs such as the following, which is a leading example in Sterling and Shapiro's book [26].

Example 2. *GC (for graph connectivity) denotes the logic program*
1. `connected(x, x)` $\leftarrow$

2. $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x},\texttt{y}) \leftarrow \texttt{edge}(\texttt{x},\texttt{z}), \texttt{connected}(\texttt{z},\texttt{y})$

There is a variable z in the tail of the second clause of GC that does not appear in its head, whereas no such variable appears in ListNat. Such a variable is called an existential variable, the presence of which challenges the algorithmic significance of lax semantics. In describing the putative coalgebra $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ just before Example 1, we referred to *all* substitutions of clauses in P into clauses with variables among $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ whose head agrees with $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. If there are no existential variables, that amounts to term-matching, which is algorithmically efficient; but if existential variables do appear, the mere presence of a unary function symbol generates an infinity of such substitutions, creating algorithmic difficulty, which, when first introducing lax semantics, we, also Bonchi and Zanasi, avoided modelling by replacing the outer instance of P_f by P_c, thus allowing for countably many choices. That is the second of the two problems mentioned just before Example 1. We have long sought a more elegant resolution to that, one that restricts the construction of p to finitely many substitutions. We finally found and presented such a resolution in the workshop paper [25] that this paper extends. We both refine it a little more, as explained later, and give more detail here.

The conceptual key to the resolution was to isolate and give finitary lax semantics to the notion of *coinductive tree* [27, 1]. Coinductive trees arise from term-matching resolution [27, 1], which is a restriction of SLD-resolution. It captures the theorem proving aspect of logic programming, which is distinct from, but complementary with, its problem solving aspect, which is captured by SLD-resolution [12, 11]. We called the derivation trees arising from term-matching coinductive trees in order to mark their connection with coalgebraic logic programming, which we also developed. Syntactically, one can observe the difference between lax semantics and saturation semantics in that lax semantics models coinductive trees, which are finitely branching, whereas saturation involves infinitely many possible substitutions, leading Bonchi and Zanasi to model different kinds of trees, their focus being on proof search rather than on theorem proving.

Chronologically, we introduced lax semantics in 2011 as above [17]; lax semantics inspired us to investigate term-matching and to introduce the notion of coinductive tree [27]; because of the possibility of existential variables, our lax semantics for coinductive trees, despite inspiring the notion, was potentially infinitary [1]; so we have now refined lax semantics to ensure finitariness of the semantics for coinductive trees, even in the presence of existential variables [25], introducing it in the workshop paper that this paper extends. We further refine lax semantics here to start to build a precise relationship with the semantics of local variables [28], which we plan to develop further in future. We regard it as positive that lax semantics brings to the fore, in semantic terms, the significance of existential variables, and allows a precise semantic relationship between the role of variables in logic programming and local variables as they arise in programming more generally.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we set logic programming terminology, explain the relationship between term-rewriting and SLD-resolution, and introduce the notion of coinductive tree. In Section 3, we give semantics for variable-free logic programs. This semantics could equally be seen as lax semantics or saturated semantics, as they agree in the absence of variables. In Section 4, we model coinductive trees for logic programs without existential variables and explain the difficulty in modelling coinductive trees for arbitrary logic programs. In Section 5, we recall saturation semantics and make precise the relationship between it and lax semantics. We devote Section 6 of the paper to refining lax semantics, while maintaining the relationship with saturation semantics, to model the coinductive trees generated by logic programs with existential variables, and in Section 7, we start to build a precise relationship with the semantics of local state [28].

2. Theorem proving in logic programming

A *signature* Σ consists of a set $\mathcal{F}$ of function symbols $f, g, \ldots$ each equipped with an arity. Nullary (0-ary) function symbols are constants. For any set Var of variables, the set $Ter(\Sigma)$ of terms over Σ is defined inductively as usual:

- $x \in Ter(\Sigma)$ for every $x \in Var$.
- If f is an n-ary function symbol ($n \geq 0$) and $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in Ter(\Sigma)$, then $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in Ter(\Sigma)$.

A *substitution* over Σ is a (total) function $\sigma : Var \to \mathbf{Term}(\Sigma)$. Substitutions are extended from variables to terms as usual: if $t \in \mathbf{Term}(\Sigma)$ and σ is a substitution, then the *application* $\sigma(t)$ is a result of applying σ to all variables in t. A substitution σ is a *unifier* for t, u if $\sigma(t) = \sigma(u)$, and is a *matcher* for t against u if $\sigma(t) = u$. A substitution σ is a *most general unifier* (*mgu*) for t and u if it is a unifier for t and u and is more general than any other such unifier. A *most general matcher* (*mgm*) σ for t against u is defined analogously.

In line with logic programming (LP) tradition [8], we consider a set $\mathcal{P}$ of predicate symbols each equipped with an arity. It is possible to define logic programs over terms only, in line with the term-rewriting (TRS) tradition [29], as in [11], but we will follow the usual LP tradition here. That gives us the following inductive definitions of the sets of atomic formulae, Horn clauses and logic programs (we also include the definition of terms for convenience).

Definition 1.
Terms $Ter \ ::= \ Var \mid \mathcal{F}(Ter, ..., Ter)$
Atomic formulae (or atoms) $At \ ::= \ \mathcal{P}(Ter, ..., Ter)$
(Horn) clauses $HC \ ::= \ At \leftarrow At, ..., At$
Logic programs $Prog \ ::= HC, ..., HC$

In what follows, we will use letters A, B, C, D, possibly with subscripts, to refer to elements of At.

Given a logic program P, we may ask whether a given atom is logically entailed by P. E.g., given the program ListNat we may ask whether $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{0}, \texttt{nil}))$ is entailed by ListNat. The following rule, which is a restricted form of SLD-resolution, provides a semi-decision procedure to derive the entailment.

Definition 2 (Term-matching (TM) Resolution).

$$\frac{}{P \vdash [\,]} \qquad \frac{P \vdash \sigma A_1 \quad \cdots \quad P \vdash \sigma A_n}{P \vdash \sigma A} \; \textit{if } (A \leftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_n) \in P$$

In contrast, the SLD-resolution rule could be presented in the following form:

$$B_1, \ldots, B_j, \ldots, B_n \rightsquigarrow_P \sigma B_1, \ldots, \sigma A_1, \ldots, \sigma A_n, \ldots, \sigma B_n$$

if $(A \leftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_n) \in P$, and σ is the mgu of A and B_j. The derivation for A succeeds when $A \rightsquigarrow_P [\,]$; we use $\rightsquigarrow_P^*$ to denote several steps of SLD-resolution.

At first sight, the difference between TM-resolution and SLD-resolution may seem only to be notational. Indeed, both $ListNat \vdash \texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{0}, \texttt{nil}))$ and $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{0}, \texttt{nil})) \rightsquigarrow_{ListNat}^* [\,]$ by the above rules (see also Figure 1). However, $ListNat \nvdash \texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}))$ whereas $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})) \rightsquigarrow_{ListNat}^* [\,]$. And, even more mysteriously, $GC \nvdash \texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})$ while $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}) \rightsquigarrow_{GC} [\,]$.

In fact, TM-resolution reflects the *theorem proving* aspect of LP: the rules of Definition 2 can be used to semi-decide whether a given term t is entailed by P. In contrast, SLD-resolution reflects the *problem solving* aspect of LP: using the SLD-resolution rule, one asks whether, for a given t, a substitution σ can be found such that $P \vdash \sigma(t)$. There is a subtle but important difference between these two aspects of proof search.

For example, when considering the successful derivation $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})) \rightsquigarrow_{ListNat}^* [\,]$, we assume that $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}))$ holds only relative to a computed substitution, e.g. $\texttt{x} \mapsto \texttt{0}$, $\texttt{y} \mapsto \texttt{nil}$. Of course this distinction is natural from the point of view of theorem proving: $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}))$ is not a "theorem" in this generality, but its special case, $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{0}, \texttt{nil}))$, is. Thus, $ListNat \vdash \texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{0}, \texttt{nil}))$ but $ListNat \nvdash \texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}))$ (see also Figure 1). Similarly, $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}) \rightsquigarrow_{GC} [\,]$ should be read as: $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})$ holds relative to the computed substitution $\texttt{y} \mapsto \texttt{x}$.

According to the soundness and completeness theorems for SLD-resolution [8], the derivation $\rightsquigarrow$ has *existential* meaning, i.e. when $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})) \rightsquigarrow_{ListNat}^* [\,]$, the successful goal $\texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}))$ is not meant to be read as universally quantified over $\texttt{x}$ and $\texttt{y}$. In contrast, TM-resolution proves a universal statement. So $GC \vdash \texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{x})$ reads as: $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{x})$ is entailed by GC for any $\texttt{x}$.

Much of our recent work has been devoted to formal understanding of the relation between the theorem proving and problem solving aspects of LP [11, 12]. The type-theoretic semantics of TM-resolution, given by "Horn clauses as types, λ-terms as proofs" is given in [12, 13].

Definition 2 gives rise to derivation trees. E.g. the derivation (or, equivalently, the proof) for $ListNat \vdash \texttt{list}(\texttt{cons}(\texttt{0}, \texttt{nil}))$ can be represented by the following derivation tree:



Figure 1: **Left:** a coinductive tree for list(cons(0, nil)) and the extended program $ListNat^+$. **Right:** a coinductive tree for list(cons(x, y)) and $ListNat^+$. The •-nodes mark different clauses applicable to every atom in the tree.



In general, given a term t and a program P, more than one derivation for $P \vdash t$ is possible. For example, if we add a fifth clause to the program $ListNat$:
5. list(cons(0, x)) ← list(x)
then yet another, alternative, proof is possible for the extended program: $ListNat^+ \vdash$ list(cons(0, nil)) via Clause 5:



To reflect the choice of derivation strategies at every stage of the derivation, we introduce a new kind of node called an *or-node*. In our example, this would give us the tree shown in Figure 1: note the •-nodes.

This intuition is made precise in the following definition of a *coinductive tree*, which first appeared in [17, 1] and was refined in [11] under the name of a rewriting tree. Note the use of mgms (rather than mgus) in the last item.

Definition 3 (Coinductive tree). *Let P be a logic program and A be an atomic formula. The* coinductive tree *for A is the possibly infinite tree T satisfying the following properties.*

- *A is the root of T*
- *Each node in T is either an and-node or an or-node*
- *Each or-node is given by •*
- *Each and-node is an atom*

- *For every and-node A' occurring in T, if there is a clause C_i in P of the form $B_i \leftarrow B_1^i, \ldots, B_{n_i}^i$ for some n_i, such that $A' = \theta B_i$ for the mgm θ, then A' has an or-node, and that or-node has children given by and-nodes $\theta(B_j^i), \ldots, \theta(B_k^i)$, where $B_j, \ldots, B_k \subseteq B_1, \ldots, B_{n_i}$ and $B_j, \ldots, B_k$ is the maximal such set for which $\theta(B_j^i), \ldots, \theta(B_k^i)$ are distinct.*

Coinductive trees provide a convenient model for proofs by TM-resolution.

Let us make one final observation on TM-resolution. Generally, given a program P and an atom t, one can prove that

$$t \rightsquigarrow_P^* [\,] \text{ with computed substitution } \sigma \text{ if and only if } P \vdash \sigma t.$$

This simple fact may leave the impression that proofs (and correspondingly coinductive trees) for TM-resolution are in some sense fragments of reductions by SLD-resolution. Compare, for example, the right-hand tree of Figure 1 before substitution with the larger left-hand tree obtained after the substitution. In this case, we could emulate the problem solving aspect of SLD-resolution by using coinductive trees and allowing the application of substitutions within coinductive trees, as was proposed in [27, 11, 12]. That works perfectly for programs such as ListNat, but not for existential programs: although there is a one step SLD-derivation for $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}) \rightsquigarrow_{GC} [\,]$ (with $\texttt{y} \mapsto \texttt{x}$), the TM-resolution proof for $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})$ diverges and gives rise to the following infinite coinductive tree:



Not only is the proof for $GC \vdash \texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})$ not a fragment of the derivation $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}) \rightsquigarrow_{GC} [\,]$, but it also requires more (infinitely many) variables. Thus, the operational semantics of TM-resolution and SLD-resolution can be very different for existential programs, in regard both to termination and to the number of variables involved.

This issue is largely orthogonal to that of non-termination. Consider the non-terminating (but not existential) program Bad:

$\texttt{bad}(\texttt{x}) \leftarrow \texttt{bad}(\texttt{x})$

For Bad, the operational behaviours of TM-resolution and SLD-resolution are similar: in both cases, derivations do not terminate, and both require only finitely many variables. Moreover, such programs can be analysed using similar coinductive methods in TM- and SLD-resolution [13, 30].

The problems caused by existential variables are known in the literature on theorem proving and term-rewriting [29]. In TRS [29], existential variables

are not allowed to appear in rewriting rules, and in type inference based on term rewriting or TM-resolution, the restriction to non-existential programs is common [31].

So theorem-proving, in contrast to problem-solving, is modelled by term-matching; term-matching gives rise to coinductive trees; and as explained in the introduction and, in more detail, later, coinductive trees give rise to laxness. So in this paper, we use laxness to model coinductive trees, and thereby theorem-proving in LP, and we relate our semantics with Bonchi and Zanasi's saturated semantics, which we believe primarily models the problem-solving aspect of logic programming.

Categorical semantics for existential programs, which are known to be challenging for theorem proving, is a central contribution of Section 6 and of this paper.

3. Semantics for variable-free logic programs

In this section, we recall and develop the work of [9], in regard to variable-free logic programs, i.e., we take $Var = \emptyset$ in Definition 1. Variable-free logic programs are operationally equivalent to propositional logic programs, as substitutions play no role in derivations. In this (propositional) setting, coinductive trees coincide with the and-or derivation trees known in the LP literature [4], and this semantics appears as the ground case of both lax semantics [1] and saturated semantics [2].

Proposition 1. *For any set At, there is a bijection between the set of variable-free logic programs over the set of atoms At and the set of $P_f P_f$-coalgebra structures on At, where P_f is the finite powerset functor on Set.*

Theorem 1. *Let $C(P_f P_f)$ denote the cofree comonad on $P_f P_f$. Then, given a logic program P over At, equivalently $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f(At)$, the corresponding $C(P_f P_f)$-coalgebra $\overline{p} : At \longrightarrow C(P_f P_f)(At)$ sends an atom A to the coinductive tree for A.*

Proof. Applying the work of [32] to this setting, the cofree comonad is in general determined as follows: $C(P_f P_f)(\mathrm{At})$ is the limit of the diagram

$$\ldots \longrightarrow \mathrm{At} \times P_f P_f(\mathrm{At} \times P_f P_f(\mathrm{At})) \longrightarrow \mathrm{At} \times P_f P_f(\mathrm{At}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{At}$$

with maps determined by the projection $\pi_0 : At \times P_f P_f(At) \longrightarrow At$, with applications of the functor $At \times P_f P_f(-)$ to it.

Putting $\mathrm{At}_0 = \mathrm{At}$ and $\mathrm{At}_{n+1} = \mathrm{At} \times P_f P_f \mathrm{At}_n$, and defining the cone

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 &= id : \mathrm{At} \longrightarrow \mathrm{At}(= \mathrm{At}_0) \\ p_{n+1} &= \langle id, P_f P_f(p_n) \circ p \rangle : \mathrm{At} \longrightarrow \mathrm{At} \times P_f P_f \mathrm{At}_n (= \mathrm{At}_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

the limiting property of the diagram determines the coalgebra $\overline{p} : \mathrm{At} \longrightarrow C(P_f P_f)(\mathrm{At})$. The image $\overline{p}(A)$ of an atom A is given by an element of the

limit, equivalently a map from 1 into the limit, equivalently a cone of the diagram over 1.

To give the latter is equivalent to giving an element A_0 of At, specifically $p_0(A) = A$, together with an element A_1 of $At \times P_f P_f(At)$, specifically $p_1(A) = (A, p_0(A)) = (A, p(A))$, together with an element A_2 of $At \times P_f P_f(At \times P_f P_f(At))$, etcetera. The definition of the coinductive tree for A is inherently coinductive, matching the definition of the limit, and with the first step agreeing with the definition of p. Thus it follows by coinduction that $\overline{p}(A)$ can be identified with the coinductive tree for A.

Example 3. *Let At consist of atoms* $\mathtt{A}, \mathtt{B}, \mathtt{C}$ *and* $\mathtt{D}$*. Let P denote the logic program*

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \mathtt{A} & \leftarrow & \mathtt{B}, \mathtt{C} \\ \mathtt{A} & \leftarrow & \mathtt{B}, \mathtt{D} \\ \mathtt{D} & \leftarrow & \mathtt{A}, \mathtt{C} \end{array}$$

So $p(\mathtt{A}) = \{\{\mathtt{B}, \mathtt{C}\}, \{\mathtt{B}, \mathtt{D}\}\}$*,* $p(\mathtt{B}) = p(\mathtt{C}) = \emptyset$*, and* $p(\mathtt{D}) = \{\{\mathtt{A}, \mathtt{C}\}\}$*.*

Then $p_0(\mathtt{A}) = \mathtt{A}$*, which is the root of the coinductive tree for* $\mathtt{A}$*.*

Then $p_1(\mathtt{A}) = (\mathtt{A}, p(\mathtt{A})) = (\mathtt{A}, \{\{\mathtt{B}, \mathtt{C}\}, \{\mathtt{B}, \mathtt{D}\}\})$*, which consists of the same information as in the first three levels of the coinductive tree for* $\mathtt{A}$*, i.e., the root* $\mathtt{A}$*, two or-nodes, and below each of the two or-nodes, nodes given by each atom in each antecedent of each clause with head* $\mathtt{A}$ *in the logic program P: nodes marked* $\mathtt{B}$ *and* $\mathtt{C}$ *lie below the first or-node, and nodes marked* $\mathtt{B}$ *and* $\mathtt{D}$ *lie below the second or-node, exactly as* $p_1(\mathtt{A})$ *describes.*

Continuing, note that $p_1(\mathtt{D}) = (\mathtt{D}, p(\mathtt{D})) = (\mathtt{D}, \{\{\mathtt{A}, \mathtt{C}\}\})$*. So*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} p_2(\mathtt{A}) & = & (\mathtt{A}, P_f P_f(p_1)(p(\mathtt{A}))) \\ & = & (\mathtt{A}, P_f P_f(p_1)(\{\{\mathtt{B}, \mathtt{C}\}, \{\mathtt{B}, \mathtt{D}\}\})) \\ & = & (\mathtt{A}, \{\{(\mathtt{B}, \emptyset), (\mathtt{C}, \emptyset)\}, \{(\mathtt{B}, \emptyset), (\mathtt{D}, \{\{\mathtt{A}, \mathtt{C}\}\})\}\}) \end{array}$$

which is the same information as that in the first five levels of the coinductive tree for $\mathtt{A}$*:* $p_1(\mathtt{A})$ *provides the first three levels of* $p_2(\mathtt{A})$ *because* $p_2(\mathtt{A})$ *must map to* $p_1(\mathtt{A})$ *in the cone; in the coinductive tree, there are two and-nodes at level 3, labelled by* $\mathtt{A}$ *and* $\mathtt{C}$*. As there are no clauses with head* $\mathtt{B}$ *or* $\mathtt{C}$*, no or-nodes lie below the first three of the and-nodes at level 3. However, there is one or-node lying below* $\mathtt{D}$*, it branches into and-nodes labelled by* $\mathtt{A}$ *and* $\mathtt{C}$*, which is exactly as* $p_2(\mathtt{A})$ *tells us. For picture of this tree, see Figure 2.*

4. Lax semantics for logic programs

We now lift the restriction on $Var = \emptyset$ in Definition 1 and consider first-order terms and atoms in full generality.

There are several equivalent ways in which to describe the Lawvere theory generated by a signature. So, for precision, in this paper, we define the *Lawvere*



Figure 2: The coinductive tree for `A` and the program P from Example 3.

theory $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ *generated by* a signature Σ as follows: $\mathtt{ob}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)$ is the set of natural numbers. For each natural number n, let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be a specified list of distinct variables. Define $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma(n, m)$ to be the set of m-tuples $(t_1, \ldots, t_m)$ of terms generated by the function symbols in Σ and variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Define composition in $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ by substitution.

One can readily check that these constructions satisfy the axioms for a category, with $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ having strictly associative finite products given by the sum of natural numbers. The terminal object of $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ is the natural number 0. There is a canonical identity-on-objects functor from Nat^{op} to $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$, just as there is for any Lawvere theory, and it strictly preserves finite products.

Example 4. *Consider ListNat. The constants* `0` *and* `nil` *are maps from* 0 *to* 1 *in* $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$*,* `s` *is modelled by a map from* 1 *to* 1*, and* `cons` *is modelled by a map from* 2 *to* 1*. The term* `s(0)` *is the map from* 0 *to* 1 *given by the composite of the maps modelling* `s` *and* `0`*.*

Given an arbitrary logic program P with signature Σ, we can extend the set At of atoms for a variable-free logic program to the functor $At : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \to Set$ that sends a natural number n to the set of all atomic formulae, with variables among $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, generated by the function symbols in Σ and by the predicate symbols in P. A map $f : n \to m$ in $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ is sent to the function $At(f) : At(m) \to At(n)$ that sends an atomic formula $A(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ to $A(f_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n)/x_1, \ldots, f_m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)/x_m)$, i.e., $At(f)$ is defined by substitution.

As explained in the Introduction and in [9], we cannot model a logic program by a natural transformation of the form $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ as naturality breaks down, e.g., in ListNat. So, in [17, 1], we relaxed naturality to lax naturality. In order to define it, we extended $At : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \to Set$ to have codomain $Poset$ by composing At with the inclusion of Set into $Poset$. Mildly overloading notation, we denote the composite by $At : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \to Poset$.

Definition 4. *Given functors* $H, K : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Poset$*, a* lax transformation *from* H *to* K *is the assignment to each object* n *of* $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$*, of an order-preserving function* $\alpha_n : Hn \longrightarrow Kn$ *such that for each map* $f : n \longrightarrow m$ *in* $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$*, one has*

$(Kf)(\alpha_m) \leq (\alpha_n)(Hf)$, *pictured as follows:*



Functors and lax transformations, with pointwise composition, form a locally ordered category denoted by $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$. Such categories and generalisations have been studied extensively, e.g., in [18, 19, 20, 23].

Definition 5. *Define $P_f : Poset \longrightarrow Poset$ by letting $P_f(P)$ be the partial order given by the set of finite subsets of P, with $A \leq B$ if for all $a \in A$, there exists $b \in B$ for which $a \leq b$ in P, with behaviour on maps given by image. Define P_c similarly but with countability replacing finiteness.*

We are not interested in arbitrary posets in modelling logic programming, only those that arise, albeit inductively, by taking subsets of a set qua discrete poset. So we gloss over the fact that, for an arbitrary poset P, Definition 5 may yield factoring, with the underlying set of $P_f(P)$ being a quotient of the set of subsets of P. It does not affect the line of development here.

Example 5. *Modelling Example 1, ListNat generates a lax transformation of the form $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ as follows: $At(n)$ is the set of atomic formulae in $ListNat$ with at most n variables.*

For example, $At(0)$ consists of $\mathtt{nat(0)}$, $\mathtt{nat(nil)}$, $\mathtt{list(0)}$, $\mathtt{list(nil)}$, $\mathtt{nat(s(0))}$, $\mathtt{nat(s(nil))}$, $\mathtt{list(s(0))}$, $\mathtt{list(s(nil))}$, $\mathtt{nat(cons(0,0))}$, $\mathtt{nat(cons(0,nil))}$, $\mathtt{nat(cons(nil,0))}$, $\mathtt{nat(cons(nil,nil))}$, *etcetera.*

Similarly, $At(1)$ includes all atomic formulae containing at most one (specified) variable x, thus all the elements of $At(0)$ together with $\mathtt{nat(x)}$, $\mathtt{list(x)}$, $\mathtt{nat(s(x))}$, $\mathtt{list(s(x))}$, $\mathtt{nat(cons(0,x))}$, $\mathtt{nat(cons(x,0))}$, $\mathtt{nat(cons(x,x))}$, *etcetera.*

The function $p_n : At(n) \longrightarrow P_f P_f At(n)$ sends each element of $At(n)$, i.e., each atom $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with variables among $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, to the set of sets of atoms in the antecedent of each unifying substituted instance of a clause in P with head for which a unifying substitution agrees with $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Taking $n = 0$, $\mathtt{nat(0)} \in At(0)$ *is the head of one clause, and there is no other clause for which a unifying substitution will make its head agree with* $\mathtt{nat(0)}$. *The clause with head* $\mathtt{nat(0)}$ *has the empty set of atoms as its tail, so* $p_0(\mathtt{nat(0)}) = \{\emptyset\}$.

Taking $n = 1$, $\mathtt{list(cons(x,0))} \in At(1)$ *is the head of one clause given by a unifying substititution applied to the final clause of ListNat, and accordingly* $p_1(\mathtt{list(cons(x,0))}) = \{\{\mathtt{nat(x)}, \mathtt{list(0)}\}\}$.

The family of functions p_n satisfy the inequality required to form a lax transformation precisely because of the allowability of substitution instances of

clauses, as in turn is required to model logic programming. The family does not satisfy the strict requirement of naturality as explained in the introduction.

Example 6. *Attempting to model Example 2, that of graph connectedness, GC, by mimicking the modelling of ListNat in Example 5, i.e., defining the function* $p_n : At(n) \longrightarrow P_f P_f At(n)$ *by sending each element of* $At(n)$*, i.e., each atom* $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *with variables among* $x_1, \ldots, x_n$*, to the set of sets of atoms in the antecedent of each unifying substituted instance of a clause in* P *with head for which a unifying substitution agrees with* $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$*, fails.*

Consider the clause

$$\texttt{connected(x, y)} \leftarrow \texttt{edge(x, z)}, \texttt{connected(z, y)}$$

Modulo possible renaming of variables, the head of the clause, i.e., the atom $\texttt{connected(x, y)}$*, lies in* $At(2)$ *as it has two variables. There is trivially only one substituted instance of a clause in GC with head for which a unifying substitution agrees with* $\texttt{connected(x, y)}$*, and the singleton set consisting of the set of atoms in its antecedent is* $\{\{\texttt{edge(x, z)}, \texttt{connected(z, y)}\}\}$*, which does not lie in* $P_f P_f At(2)$ *as it has three variables appear in it rather than two. See Section 2 for a picture of the coinductive tree for* $\texttt{connected(x, y)}$*.*

We dealt with that inelegantly in [17]: in order to force $p_2(\texttt{connected(x, y)})$ *to lie in* $P_f P_f At(2)$ *and model GC in any reasonable sense, we allowed substitutions for* z *in* $\{\{\texttt{edge(x, z)}, \texttt{connected(z, y)}\}\}$ *by any term on* x, y *on the basis that there is no unifying such, so we had better allow all possibilities. So, rather than modelling the clause directly, recalling that* $At(2) \subseteq At(3) \subseteq At(4)$*, etcetera, modulo renaming of variables, we put*

$$\begin{aligned}
p_2(\texttt{connected(x, y)}) &= \{\{\texttt{edge(x, x)}, \texttt{connected(x, y)}\}, \{\texttt{edge(x, y)}, \texttt{connected(y, y)}\}\} \\
p_3(\texttt{connected(x, y)}) &= \{\{\texttt{edge(x, x)}, \texttt{connected(x, y)}\}, \{\texttt{edge(x, y)}, \texttt{connected(y, y)}\}, \\
&\quad \{\texttt{edge(x, z)}, \texttt{connected(z, y)}\}\} \\
p_4(\texttt{connected(x, y)}) &= \{\{\texttt{edge(x, x)}, \texttt{connected(x, y)}\}, \{\texttt{edge(x, y)}, \texttt{connected(y, y)}\}, \\
&\quad \{\texttt{edge(x, z)}, \texttt{connected(z, y)}\}, \{\texttt{edge(x, w)}, \texttt{connected(w, y)}\}\}
\end{aligned}$$

etcetera: for p_2*, as only two variables* x *and* y *appear in any element of* $P_f P_f At(2)$*, we allowed substitution by either* x *or* y *for* z*; for* p_3*, a third variable may appear in an element of* $P_f P_f At(3)$*, allowing an additional possible subsitution; for* p_4*, a fourth variable may appear, etcetera.*

Countability arises if a unary symbol s *is added to GC, as in that case, for* p_2*, not only did we allow* x *and* y *to be substituted for* z*, but we also allowed* $s^n(x)$ *and* $s^n(y)$ *for any* $n > 0$*, and to do that, we replaced* $P_f P_f$ *by* $P_c P_f$*, allowing for the countably many possible substitutions.*

Those were inelegant decisions, but they allowed us to give some kind of model of all logic programs. We shall revisit this in Section 6.

We shall refine lax semantics to account for existential variables later, so for the present, we shall ignore Example 6 and only analyse semantics for logic

programs without existential variables such as in Example 5. Specifically, we shall analyse the relationship between a lax transformation $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ and $\overline{p} : At \longrightarrow C(P_f P_f)At$, the corresponding coalgebra for the cofree comonad $C(P_f P_f)$ on $P_f P_f$.

We recall the central abstract result of [17], the notion of an "oplax" map of coalgebras being required to match that of lax transformation. Notation of the form *H-coalg* refers to coalgebras for an endofunctor H, while notation of the form *C-Coalg* refers to coalgebras for a comonad C. The subscript *oplax* refers to oplax maps and, given an endofunctor E on $Poset$, the notation $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, E)$ denotes the endofunctor on $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ given by post-composition with E; similarly for a comonad.

Theorem 2. *[17] For any locally ordered endofunctor E on $Poset$, if $C(E)$ is the cofree comonad on E, then there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, E)\text{-}coalg_{oplax} \simeq Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, C(E))\text{-}Coalg_{oplax}$$

Theorem 2 tells us that for any endofunctor E on $Poset$, the relationship between E-coalgebras and $C(E)$-coalgebras extends pointwise from $Poset$ to $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ providing one matches lax natural transformations by oplax maps of coalgebras. It follows that, given an endofunctor E on $Poset$ with cofree comonad $C(E)$, the cofree comonad for the endofunctor on $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ sending $H : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Poset$ to the composite $EH : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Poset$ sends H to the composite $C(E)H$. Taking the example $E = P_f P_f$ allows us to conclude the following.

Corollary 1. *[17] $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, C(P_f P_f))$ is the cofree comonad on $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, P_f P_f)$.*

Corollary 1 means that there is a natural bijection between lax transformations

$$p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$$

and lax transformations

$$\overline{p} : At \longrightarrow C(P_f P_f)At$$

subject to the two conditions required of a coalgebra of a comonad given pointwise, thus by applying the construction of Theorem 1 pointwise. So it is the abstract result we need in order to characterise the coinductive trees generated by logic programs with no existential variables, extending Theorem 1 as follows.

Theorem 3. *Let $C(P_f P_f)$ denote the cofree comonad on the endofunctor $P_f P_f$ on $Poset$. Then, given a logic program P with no existential variables on At, defining $p_n(A(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$ to be the set of sets of atoms in each antecedent of each unifying substituted instance of a clause in P with head for which a unifying substitution agrees with $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, the corresponding $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, C(P_f P_f))$-coalgebra $\overline{p} : At \longrightarrow C(P_f P_f)At$ sends an atom $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ to the coinductive tree for $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.*

PROOF. The absence of existential variables ensures that any variable that appears in the antecedent of a clause must also appear in its head. So every atom in every antecedent of every unifying substituted instance of a clause in P with head for which a unifying substitution agrees with $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ actually lies in $At(n)$. Moreover, there are only finitely many sets of sets of such atoms. So the construction of each p_n is well-defined, i.e., the image of $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ lies in $P_f P_f At(n)$. The p_n's collectively form a lax transformation from At to $P_f P_f At$ as substitution preserves the truth of a clause.

By Corollary 1, $\overline{p}$ is determined pointwise. So, to construct it, we may fix n and follow the proof of Theorem 1, consistently replacing At by $At(n)$. To complete the proof, observe that the construction of p from a logic program P matches the construction of the coinductive tree for an atom $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ if P has no existential variables. So following the proof of Theorem 1 completes this proof.

Theorem 3 models the coinductive trees generated by ListNat as the latter has no existential variables, but for GC, as explained in Example 6, the natural construction of p did *not* model the clause

$$\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}) \leftarrow \texttt{edge}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{z}), \texttt{connected}(\texttt{z}, \texttt{y})$$

directly, and so its extension *a fortiori* could *not* model the coinductive trees generated by $\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y})$.

For arbitrary logic programs, the way we defined $\overline{p}(A(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$ in earlier papers such as [1] was in terms of a variant of the coinductive tree generated by $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in two key ways:

1. coinductive trees allow new variables to be introduced as one passes down the tree, e.g., with

   $$\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}) \leftarrow \texttt{edge}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{z}), \texttt{connected}(\texttt{z}, \texttt{y})$$

   appearing directly in it, whereas, if we extended the construction of p in Example 6, $\overline{p_1}(\texttt{connected}(\texttt{x}, \texttt{y}))$ would not model such a clause directly, but would rather substitute terms on x and y for z, continuing inductively as one proceeds.
2. coinductive trees are finitely branching, as one expects in logic programming, whereas $\overline{p}(A(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$ could be infinitely branching, e.g., for GC with an additional unary operation s.

5. Saturated semantics for logic programs

Bonchi and Zanasi's saturated semantics approach to modelling logic programming in [14] was to consider $P_f P_f$ as we did in [17], sending At to $P_f P_f At$, but to ignore the inherent laxness, replacing $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ by $[ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma), Set]$, where $ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)$ is the set of objects of $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ treated as a discrete category, i.e., as a category containing only identity maps. Their central construction may be seen in a more axiomatic setting as follows.

For any small category C, let $ob(C)$ denote the discrete subcategory with the same objects as C, with inclusion $I : ob(C) \longrightarrow C$. Then the functor

$$[I, Set] : [C, Set] \longrightarrow [ob(C), Set]$$

has a right adjoint given by right Kan extension, and that remains true when one extends from Set to any complete category, and it all enriches, e.g., over $Poset$ [3]. As $ob(C)$ has no non-trivial arrows, the right Kan extension is a product, given by

$$(ran_I H)(c) = \prod_{d \in C} H d^{C(c,d)}$$

By the Yoneda lemma, to give a natural transformation from K to $(ran_I H)(-)$ is equivalent to giving a natural, or equivalently in this setting, a "not necessarily natural", transformation from KI to H. Taking $C = \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}$ gives exactly Bonchi and Zanasi's formulation of saturated semantics [14].

It was the fact of the existence of the right adjoint, rather than its characterisation as a right Kan extension, that enabled Bonchi and Zanasi's constructions of saturation and desaturation, but the description as a right Kan extension informed their syntactic analysis.

Note for later that products in $Poset$ are given pointwise, so agree with products in Set. So if we replace Set by $Poset$ here, and if C is an ordinary category without any non-trivial $Poset$-enrichment, the right Kan extension would yield the same set as above, with an order on it determined by that on H.

In order to unify saturated semantics with lax semantics, we need to rephrase Bonchi and Zanasi's formulation a little. Upon close inspection, one can see that, in their semantics, they only used objects of $[ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op}, Set]$, equivalently $[ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma), Set]$, of the form HI for some $H : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Set$ [14]. That allows us, while making no substantive change to their body of work, to reformulate it a little, in axiomatic terms, as follows.

Let $[C, Set]_d$ denote the category of functors from C to Set and "not necessarily natural" transformations between them, i.e., a map from H to K consists of, for all $c \in C$, a function $\alpha_c : Hc \longrightarrow Kc$, without demanding a naturality condition. The functor $[I, Set] : [C, Set] \longrightarrow [ob(C), Set]$ factors through the inclusion of $[C, Set]$ into $[C, Set]_d$ as follows:

$$[C, Set] \longrightarrow [C, Set]_d \longrightarrow [ob(C), Set]$$

In this decomposition, the functor from $[C, Set]_d$ to $[ob(C), Set]$ sends a functor $H : C \longrightarrow Set$ to its restriction HI to $ob(C)$ and is fully faithful. Because it is fully faithful, it follows that the inclusion of $[C, Set]$ into $[C, Set]_d$ has a right adjoint also given by right Kan extension.

Thus one can reprhrase Bonchi and Zanasi's work to assert that the central mathematical fact that supports saturated semantics is that the inclusion

$$[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set] \longrightarrow [\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]_d$$

has a right adjoint that sends a functor $H : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Set$ to the right Kan extension $ran_I HI$ of the composite $HI : ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op} \longrightarrow Set$ along the inclusion $I : ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_\Sigma$.

We can now unify lax semantics with saturated semantics by developing a precise body of theory that relates the inclusion

$$J : [C, Set] \longrightarrow [C, Set]_d$$

which has a right adjoint that sends $H : C \longrightarrow Set$ to $ran_I HI$, with the inclusion

$$J : [C, Poset] \longrightarrow Lax(C, Poset)$$

which also has a right adjoint, that right adjoint being given by a restriction of the right Kan extension $ran_I HI$ of the composite $HI : ob(C) \longrightarrow Poset$ along the inclusion $I : ob(C) \longrightarrow C$.

The existence of the right adjoint follows from the main result of [19], but we give an independent proof here and a description of it in terms of right Kan extensions in order to show that Bonchi and Zanasi's explicit constructions of saturation and desaturation apply equally in this setting.

Consider the inclusions

$$[C, Poset] \longrightarrow Lax(C, Poset) \longrightarrow [C, Poset]_d$$

As we have seen, the composite has a right adjoint sending $H : C \longrightarrow Poset$ to $ran_I HI$. So, to describe a right adjoint to $J : [C, Poset] \longrightarrow Lax(C, Poset)$, we need to restrict $ran_I HI$ so that to give a natural transformation from K into the restriction $R(H)$ of $ran_I HI$ is equivalent to giving a map from H to K in $[C, Poset]_d$ that satisfies the condition that, for all $f : c \longrightarrow d$, one has $Hf.\alpha_c \leq \alpha_d.Kf$. This can be done by defining $R(H)$ to be an *inserter*, which is a particularly useful kind of limit that applies to locally ordered categories and is a particular kind of generalisation of the notion of equaliser.

Definition 6. *[19] Given parallel maps $f, g : X \longrightarrow Y$ in a locally ordered category K, an* inserter *from f to g is an object $Ins(f, g)$ of K together with a map $i : Ins(f, g) \longrightarrow X$ such that $fi \leq gi$ and is universal such, i.e., for any object Z and map $z : Z \longrightarrow X$ for which $fz \leq gz$, there is a unique map $k : Z \longrightarrow Ins(f, g)$ such that $ik = z$. Moreover, for any such z and z' for which $z \leq z'$, then $k \leq k'$, where k and k' are induced by z and z' respectively.*

An inserter is a form of limit. Taking K to be $Poset$, the poset $Ins(f, g)$ is given by the full sub-poset of X determined by $\{x \in X | f(x) \leq g(x)\}$. Being limits, inserters in functor categories are determined pointwise.

Theorem 4. *The right adjoint R to the inclusion $J : [C, Poset] \longrightarrow Lax(C, Poset)$ sends $H : C \longrightarrow Poset$ to the inserter in $[C, Poset]$ from δ_1 to δ_2*

$$\delta_1, \delta_2 : (ran_I H)(-) = \prod_{d \in C} Hd^{C(-,d)} \longrightarrow \prod_{d,d' \in C} Hd'^{C(-,d) \times C(d,d')}$$

where δ_1 and δ_2 are defined to be equivalent, by Currying, to (d, d')-indexed collections of maps of the form

$$(\delta_1)_{(d,d')}, (\delta_2)_{(d,d')} : C(-, d) \times C(d, d') \times \prod_{d \in C} Hd^{C(-,d)} \longrightarrow Hd'$$

which, in turn, are defined as follows:

1. *the (d, d')-component of $\delta_1 c$ is determined by composing*

$$\circ_C \times id : C(c, d) \times C(d, d') \times \prod_{d \in C} Hd^{C(c,d)} \longrightarrow C(c, d') \times \prod_{d \in C} Hd^{C(c,d)}$$

   with the evaluation of the product at d'
2. *the (d, d')-component of $\delta_2 c$ is determined by evaluating the product at d*

$$C(c, d) \times C(d, d') \times \prod_{d \in C} Hd^{C(c,d)} \longrightarrow C(d, d') \times Hd$$

   then composing with

$$C(d, d') \times Hd \xrightarrow{H \times id} Hd'^{Hd} \times Hd \xrightarrow{eval} Hd'$$

Although the statement of the theorem is complex, the proof is routine. One simply needs to check that δ_1 and δ_2 are natural, which they routinely are, and that the inserter satisfies the universal property we seek, which it does by construction.

Bonchi and Zanasi's saturation and desaturation constructions remain exactly the same: the saturation of $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ is a natural transformation $\overline{p} : At \longrightarrow ran_I P_f P_f At I$ that factors through $Ins(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ without any change whatsoever to its construction, that being so because of the fact of p being lax.

With this result in hand, it is routine to work systematically through Bonchi and Zanasi's papers, using their saturation and desaturation constructions exactly as they had them, without discarding the inherent laxness that logic programming, cf data refinement, possesses.

So this unifies lax semantics, which flows from, and may be seen as an instance of, Tony Hoare's semantics for data refinement [21, 22, 23], with saturated semantics and its more denotational flavour [6].

6. Lax semantics for logic progams refined: existential variables

In Section 4, following [17], we gave lax semantics for logic programs without existential variables, such as ListNat. In particular, we modelled the coinductive trees they generate. Restriction to non-existential examples such as ListNat is common for implementational reasons [1, 11, 12, 13], so Section 4 allowed the modelling of coinductive trees for a natural class of logic programs.

Nevertheless, we would like to model coinductive trees generated by logic programming in full generality, including examples such as that of GC. We

need to refine the lax semantics of Section 4 in order to do so, and, having just unified lax semantics with saturated semantics in Section 5, we would like to retain that unity in making such a refinement. So that is what we do in this section.

We initially proposed such a refinement in the workshop paper [25] that this paper extends, but since the workshop, we have found a further refinement that strengthens the relationship with the modelling of local state [28]. So our constructions here are a little different to those in [25].

In order to model coinductive trees, it follows from Example 6 that the endofunctor $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, P_f P_f)$ on $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ that sends At to $P_f P_f At$, needs to be refined as $\{\{\mathtt{edge(x,z)}, \mathtt{connected(z,y)}\}\}$ is not an element of $P_f P_f At(2)$ as it involves three variables x, y and z. In general, we need to allow the image of p_n to lie in the set given by applying $P_f P_f$ to a superset of $At(n)$, one that includes $At(m)$ for all $m \geq n$. However, we do not want to double-count: there are six injections of 2 into 3, inducing six inclusions $At(2) \subseteq At(3)$, and one only wants to count each atom in $At(2)$ once. So we refine $P_f P_f At(n)$ to become $P_f P_f(\int At(n))$, where $\int At$ is defined as follows.

Letting Inj denote the category of natural numbers and injections, for any Lawvere theory L, there is a canonical identity-on-objects functor $J : Inj^{op} \longrightarrow L$. We define $\int At(n)$ to be the colimit of the composite functor

$$n/Inj \xrightarrow{cod} Inj \xrightarrow{J} \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \xrightarrow{At} Poset$$

This functor sends an injection $j : n \longrightarrow m$ to $At(m)$, with the j-th component of the colimiting cocone being of the form $\rho_j : At(m) \longrightarrow \int At(n)$. The colimiting property is precisely the condition required to ensure no double-counting (see [33] or, for the enriched version, [3] of this construction in a general setting).

It is not routine to extend the construction of $\int At(n)$ to be functorial in Inj. So we mimic the construction on arrows used to define the monad for local state in [28]. We first used this idea in [25] and we refine our use of it in this paper to make for a closer technical relationship with the semantics of local state in [28]: we do not fully understand the relationship yet, but there seems considerable potential based on the work here to make precise comparison between the role of variables in logic programming with that of worlds in modelling local state.

In detail, the definition of $\int At(n)$ extends canonically to become a functor $\int At : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Poset$ that sends a map $f : n \longrightarrow n'$ in $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ to the order-preserving function

$$\int At(f) : \int At(n') \longrightarrow \int At(n)$$

determined by the colimiting property of $\int At(n')$ as follows: each $j' \in n'/Inj$ is, up to coherent isomorphism, the canonical injection $j' : n' \longrightarrow n' + k$ for a unique natural number k; that induces a cocone

$$At(n' + k) \xrightarrow{At(f+k)} At(n + k) \xrightarrow{\rho_j} \int At(n)$$

where $j : n \longrightarrow n + k$ is the canonical injection of n into $n + k$. It is routine to check that this assignment respects compostion and identities, thus is functorial.

There is nothing specific about At in the above construction. So it generalises without fuss from At to apply to an arbitrary functor $H : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Poset$.

In order to make the construction $\int H$ functorial in H, i.e., in order to make it respect maps $\alpha : H \Rightarrow K$, we need to refine $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$. Specifically, we need to restrict its maps to allow only those lax transformations $\alpha : H \Rightarrow K$ that are strict with respect to maps in Inj, i.e., those α such that for any injection $i : n \longrightarrow m$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Hn & \xrightarrow{\alpha_n} & Kn \\ {\scriptstyle Hi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Ki} \\ Hm & \xrightarrow[\alpha_m]{} & Km \end{array}$$

commutes. The reason for the restriction is that the colimit that defines $\int H(n)$ strictly respects injections, so we need a matching condition on α in order to be able to define $\int \alpha(n)$.

Summarising this discussion yields the following:

Definition 7. *Let $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ denote the category with objects given by functors from $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}$ to $Poset$, maps given by lax transformations that strictly respect injections, and composition given pointwise.*

Proposition 2. *cf [28] Let $J : Inj^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ be the canonical inclusion. Define*

$$\int : Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset) \longrightarrow Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$$

on objects as above. Given $\alpha : H \Rightarrow K$, define $\int \alpha(n)$ by the fact that $j \in n/Inj$ is coherently isomorphic to the canonical inclusion $j : n \longrightarrow n + k$ for a unique natural number k, and applying the definition of $\int H(n)$ as a colimit to the cocone given by composing

$$\alpha_{n+k} : H(m) = H(n + k) \longrightarrow K(n + k) = K(m)$$

with the canonical map $K(m) \longrightarrow \int K(n)$ exhibiting $\int K(n)$ as a colimit. Then $\int(-)$ is an endofunctor on $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$.

The proof is routine, albeit after lengthy calculation involving colimits.

We can now model an arbitrary logic program by a map $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f \int At$ in $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$, modelling ListNat as we did in Example 5 but now modelling the clauses of GC directly rather than using the awkward substitution instances of Example 6.

Example 7. *Except for the restriction of* $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ *to* $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$*, ListNat is modelled in exactly the same way here as it was in Example 5, the reason being that no clause in ListNat has a variable in the tail that does not already appear in the head. We need only observe that, although* p *is not strictly natural in general, it does strictly respect injections. For example, if one views* $\mathtt{list}(\mathtt{cons}(\mathtt{x}, 0))$ *as an element of* $At(2)$*, its image under* p_2 *agrees with its image under* p_1*.*

Example 8. *In contrast to Example 6, using* $P_f P_f \int$*, we can emulate the construction of Examples 5 and 7 for ListNat to model GC.*

Modulo possible renaming of variables, $\mathtt{connected}(\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{y})$ *is an element of* $At(2)$*. The function* p_2 *sends it to the element* $\{\{\mathtt{edge}(\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{z}), \mathtt{connected}(\mathtt{z}, \mathtt{y})\}\}$ *of* $(P_f P_f \int At)(2)$*. This is possible by taking* $n = 2$ *and* $m = 3$ *in the formula for* $\int At$*. In contrast,* $\{\{\mathtt{edge}(\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{z}), \mathtt{connected}(\mathtt{z}, \mathtt{y})\}\}$ *is not an element of* $P_f P_f At(2)$*, hence the failure of Example 6.*

The behaviour of $P_f P_f \int At$ *on maps ensures that the lax transformation* p *strictly respects injections. For example, if* $\mathtt{connected}(\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{y})$ *is seen as an element of* $At(3)$*, the additional variable is treated as a fresh variable* w*, so does not affect the image of* $\mathtt{connected}(\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{y})$ *under* p_3*.*

Theorem 5. *The functor* $P_f P_f \int : Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset) \longrightarrow Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ *induces a cofree comonad* $C(P_f P_f \int)$ *on* $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$*. Moreover, given a logic progam* P *qua* $P_f P_f \int$*-coalgebra* $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f \int At$*, the corresponding* $C(P_f P_f \int)$*-coalgebra* $\overline{p} : At \longrightarrow C(P_f P_f \int)(At)$ *sends an atom* $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in At(n)$ *to the coinductive tree for* $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$*.*

Proof. If one restricts $P_f P_f \int$ to $[Inj, Poset]$, there is a cofree comonad on it for general reasons, $[Inj, Poset]$ being locally finitely presentable and $P_f P_f \int$ being an accessible functor [32]. However, as we seek a little more generality than that, and for completeness, we shall construct the cofree comonad.

Observe that products in the category $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ are given pointwise, with pointwise projections. Moreover, those projections are strictly natural, as one can check directly but which is also an instance of the main result of [19].

We can describe the cofree comonad $C(P_f P_f \int)$ on $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ pointwise as the same limit as in the proof of Theorem 1, similarly to Theorem 3. In particular, replacing At by $At(n)$ and replacing $P_f P_f$ by $P_f P_f \int$ in the diagram in the proof of Theorem 1, one has

$$\ldots \longrightarrow \mathrm{At}(n) \times (P_f P_f \int)(\mathrm{At} \times P_f P_f \int \mathrm{At})(n) \longrightarrow \mathrm{At}(n) \times (P_f P_f \int \mathrm{At})(n) \longrightarrow \mathrm{At}(n)$$

with maps determined by the projection $\pi_0 : At(-) \times (P_f P_f \int) At(-) \longrightarrow At(-)$, with the endofunctor $P_f P_f \int$ applied to it. One takes the limit, potentially transfinite [32], of the diagram. The limit property routinely determines a functor $C(P_f P_f \int) At$.

It is routine, albeit tedious, to use the limiting property to verify functoriality of $C(P_f P_f \int)$ with respect to all maps, to define the counit and comultiplication,

and to verify their axioms and the universal property. The construction of $\overline{p}$ is given pointwise, with it following from its coinductive construction that it yields the coinductive trees as required: because of our construction of $\int At$ to take the place At in Theorem 3, the image of p lies in $P_f P_f \int At$.

The lax naturality in respect to general maps $f : m \longrightarrow n$ means that a substitution applied to an atom $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in At(n)$, i.e., application of the function $At(f)$ to $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, followed by application of $\overline{p}$, i.e., taking the coinductive tree for the substituted atom, or application of the function $(C(P_f P_f \int)At)f)$ to the coinductive tree for $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ potentially yield different trees: the former substitutes into $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, then takes its coinductive tree, while the latter applies a substitution to each node of the coinductive tree for $A(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, then prunes to remove redundant branches.

Example 9. *Extending Example 8, consider* $\mathtt{connected(x, y)} \in At(2)$. *In expressing GC as a map* $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f \int At$ *in Example 8, we put*

$$p_2(\mathtt{connected(x, y)}) = \{\{\mathtt{edge(x, z)}, \mathtt{connected(z, y)}\}\}$$

Accordingly, $\overline{p}_2(\mathtt{connected(x, y)})$ *is the coinductive tree for* $\mathtt{connected(x, y)}$*, thus the infinite tree generated by repeated application of the same clause modulo renaming of variables.*

If we substitute x *for* y *in the coinductive tree, i.e., apply the function* $(C(P_f P_f \int)At)(x, x)$ *to it (see the definition of* L_Σ *at the start of Section 4 and observe that* (x, x) *is a 2-tuple of terms generated trivially by the variable* x*), we obtain the same tree but with* y *systematically replaced by* x*. However, if we substitute* x *for* y *in* $\mathtt{connected(x, y)}$*, i.e., apply the function* $At(x, x)$ *to it, we obtain* $\mathtt{connected(x, x)} \in At(1)$*, whose coinductive tree has additional branching as the first clause of GC, i.e.,* $\mathtt{connected(x, x)} \leftarrow$ *may also be applied.*

In contrast to this, we have strict naturality with respect to injections: for example, an injection $i : 2 \longrightarrow 3$ *yields the function* $At(i) : At(2) \longrightarrow At(3)$ *that, modulo renaming of variables, sends* $\mathtt{connected(x, y)} \in At(2)$ *to itself seen as an element of* $At(3)$*, and the coinductive tree for* $\mathtt{connected(x, y)}$ *is accordingly also sent by* $(C(P_f P_f \int)At)(i)$ *to itself seen as an element of* $(C(P_f P_f \int)At)(3)$.

Example 9 illustrates why, although the condition of strict naturality with respect to injections holds for $P_f P_f \int$, it does not hold for $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, P_f P_f)$ in Example 6 as we did not model the clause

$$\mathtt{connected(x, y)} \leftarrow \mathtt{edge(x, z)}, \mathtt{connected(z, y)}$$

directly there, but rather modelled all substitution instances into all available variables.

Turning to the relationship between lax semantics and saturated semantics given in Section 5, we need to refine our construction of the right adjoint to the inclusion

$$[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset] \longrightarrow Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$$

to give a construction of a right adjoint to the inclusion

$$[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset] \longrightarrow Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$$

As was the case in Section 5, such a right adjoint exists for general reasons as an example of the main result of [19]. An explicit construction of it arises by emulating the construction of Theorem 4. In the statement of Theorem 4, putting $C = \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}$, we described a parallel pair of maps in $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset]$ and constructed their inserter, the inserter being exactly the universal property corresponding to the laxness of the maps in $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$. Here, we use the same technique but with equaliser replacing inserter, to account for the equalities in $Lax_{Inj}(C, Poset)$. Thus we take an equaliser of two variants of δ_1 and δ_2 seen as maps in $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset]$ with domain $Ins(\delta_1, \delta_2)$

Again, the constructions of saturation and desaturation remain the same, allowing us to maintain the relationship between lax semantics and saturated semantics. That said, our refinement of lax semantics constitutes a refinement of saturated semantics too, as, just as we now model GC by a lax transformation $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f \int At$, one can now consider the saturation of this definition of p rather than that of the less subtle map with codomain $P_c P_f At$ used in previous papers such as [1] and [2].

7. Semantics for variables in logic programs: local variables

The relationship between the semantics of logic programming we propose here and that of local state is yet to be explored fully, and we leave the bulk of it to future work. However, as explained in Section 6, the definition of $\int$ was informed by the semantics for local state in [28], and we have preliminary results that strengthen the relationship.

Proposition 3. *The endofunctor $\int(-)$ on $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ canonically supports the structure of a monad, with unit $\eta_H : H \Rightarrow \int H$ defined, at n, by the id_n component $\rho_{id_n} : Hn \longrightarrow \int Hn$ of the colimiting cocone, and with multiplication $\mu_H : \int\int H \Longrightarrow \int H$ defined, at n, by observing that if $m = n + k$ and $p = m + l$, then $p = n + (k + l)$ with canonical injections j_k, j_l and j_{k+l} coherent with each other, and applying the doubly indexed colimiting property of $\int\int H$ to $\rho_{j_{k+l}} : H(p) \longrightarrow \int H(n)$,*

This bears direct comparison with the monad for local state in the case where one has only one value, as studied by Stark [34]. The setting is a little different. Stark does not consider maps in $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ or laxness, and his base category is Set rather than $Poset$. However, if one restricts our definition of $\int$ and the other data for the monad of Proposition 3 to $[Inj, Set]$, one obtains Stark's construction.

The monad for local state in [28] also extends Stark's construction but in a different direction: for local state, neither Inj nor Set is extended, but state, which is defined by a functor into Set is interpolated into the definition of the

functor $\int$, which restricts to $[Inj, Set]$. That interpolation of state is closely related to our application of $P_f P_f$ to $\int$: just as the former gives rise to a monad for local state on $[Inj, Set]$, the latter bears the ingredients for a monad as follows.

Proposition 4. *For any endofunctor P on Set, here is a canonical distributive law*

$$\int P(-) \longrightarrow P \int (-)$$

of the endofunctor $P \circ -$ over the monad $\int$ on $[Inj, Set]$.

The canonicity of the distributive law arises as $\int$ is defined pointwise as a colimit, and the distributive law is the canonical comparison map determined by applying P pointwise to the colimiting cone defining $\int$.

The functor $P_f P_f$ does not quite satisfy the axioms for a monad [35] (see also [2]), but variants of $P_f P_f$, in particular $P_f M_f$, where M_f is the finite multiset monad on Set, do [35] (also see [2]). Putting $P = P_f M_f$, the distributive law of Proposition 4 respects the monad structure of $P_f M_f$, yielding a canonical monad structure on the composite $P_f M_f \int$.

The full implications of that are yet to be investigated, but, trying to emulate the analysis of local state in [28], we believe we have a natural set of operations and equations that generate the monad $P_f M_f \int$. That encourages us considerably towards the possibility of seeing the semantics for logic programming, both lax and saturated, as an example of a general semantics of local effects. We have not yet fully understood the significance of the specific combination of operations and equations generating the monad, but we are currently investigating it.

8. Conclusions and Further Work

Let P_f be the covariant finite powerset functor on Set. Then, to give a variable-free logic program P is equivalent to giving a $P_f P_f$-coalgebra structure $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ on the set At of atoms in the program. Now let $C(P_f P_f)$ be the cofree comonad on $P_f P_f$. Then, the $C(P_f P_f)$-coalgebra $\overline{p} : At \longrightarrow C(P_f P_f)At$ corresponding to p sends an atom to the coinductive tree it generates. This fact is the basis for both our lax semantics and Bonchi and Zanasi's saturated semantics for logic programming.

Two problems arise when, following standard category theoretic practice, one tries to extend this semantics to model logic programs in general by extending from Set to $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$, where $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ is the free Lawevere theory generated by a signature Σ. The first is that the natural construction $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ does not form a natural transformation, so is not a map in $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$.

Two resolutions were proposed to that: lax semantics [1], which we have been developing in the tradition of semantics for data refinement [21], and saturated semantics [2], which Bonchi and Zanasi have been developing. In this paper, we have shown that the two resolutions are complementary rather than competing,

the first modelling the theorem-proving aspect of logic programming, while the latter models proof search.

In modelling theorem-proving, lax semantics led us to identify and develop the notion of coinductive tree. To express the semantics, we extended $[\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Set]$ to $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$, the category of strict functors and lax transformations between them. We followed standard semantic practice in extended P_f from Set to $Poset$ and we postcomposed the functor $At : \mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op} \longrightarrow Poset$ by $P_f P_f$. Bonchi and Zanasi also postcomposed At by $P_f P_f$, but then saturated. We showed that their saturation and desaturation constructions are generated exactly by starting from $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ rather than from $[ob(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma)^{op}, Set]$ as they did, thus unifying the underlying mathematics of the two developments, supporting their computational coherence.

The second problem mentioned above relates to existential variables, those being variables that appear in the antecedent of a clause but not in its head. The problem of existential clauses is well-known in the literature on theorem proving and within communities that use term-rewriting, TM-resolution or their variants. In TRS [29], existential variables are not allowed to appear in rewriting rules, and in type inference, the restriction to non-existential programs is common [31]. In logic programming, the problem of handling existential variables when constructing proofs with TM-resolution marks the boundary between its theorem-proving and problem-solving aspects.

Existential variables are not present in many logic programs, but they do occasionally occur in important examples, such as those developed by Sterling and Shapiro [26]. The problem for us was that, in the presence of existential variables, the natural model $p : At \longrightarrow P_f P_f At$ of a logic program might escape its codomain, i.e., $p_n(A)$ might not lie in $P_f P_f At(n)$ because of the new variables. On one hand, we want to model them, but on the other, the fact of the difficulty for us means that we have semantically identified the concept of existential variable, which is positive.

In this paper, we have resolved the problem by refining $Lax(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$ to $Lax_{Inj}(\mathcal{L}_\Sigma^{op}, Poset)$, insisting upon strict naturality for injections, and by refining the construction $P_f P_f At$ to $P_f P_f \int At$, thus allowing for additional variables in the tail of a clause in a logic program. That has allowed us to model coinductive trees for arbitrary logic programs, in particular those including existential variables. We have also considered the effect of such refinement on saturated semantics.

In order to refine $P_f P_f(-)$, we followed a technique developed in the semantics of local state [28]. That alerted us to the relationship between variables in logic programming with the use of worlds in modelling local state. So, as ongoing work, we are now relating our semantics for logic programming with that for local state. For the future, we shall continue to develop that, with the hope of being able to locate our semantics of logic programming within a general semantics for local effects.

Beyond that, a question that we have not considered semantically at all yet but which our applied investigations are encouraging is that of modelling recursion. There are fundamentally two kinds of recursion that arise in logic

programming as there may be recursion in terms and recursion in proofs. For example, $\mathtt{stream}(\mathtt{scons}(\mathtt{x},\mathtt{y})) \leftarrow \mathtt{stream}(\mathtt{y})$ is a standard (co-)recursive definition of infinite streams in logic programming literature. More abstractly, the following program P_1: $\mathtt{p}(\mathtt{f}(\mathtt{x})) \leftarrow \mathtt{p}(\mathtt{x})$ defines an infinite data structure p with constructor f. For such cases, proofs given by coinductive trees will be finite. An infinite sequence of (finite) coinductive trees will be needed to approximate the intended operational semantics of such a program, as we discuss in detail in [1, 36]. In contrast, there are programs like P_2: $\mathtt{p}(\mathtt{x}) \leftarrow \mathtt{p}(\mathtt{x})$ or P_3: $\mathtt{p}(\mathtt{x}) \leftarrow \mathtt{p}(\mathtt{f}(\mathtt{x}))$ that are also recursive, but additionally their proofs as given by coinductive trees will have an infinite size.

In [37, 38] programs like P_1 were called productive, for producing (infinite) data, and programs like P_2 and P_3 – non-productive, for recursing without producing substitutions. The productive case amounts to a loop in the Lawvere theory $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$, while the non-productive case amounts to repetition within a coinductive tree, possibly modulo a substitution. This paper gives a close analysis of trees. That should set the scene for investigation of recursion, as it seems likely to yield more general kinds of graph that arise by identifying loops in $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma$ and by equating nodes in trees.

The lax semantics we presented here has recently inspired investigations into importance of TM-resolution (as modelled by the coinductive trees) in programming languages. In particular, TM-resolution is used in type class inference in Haskell [31]. In [13, 39] we showed applications of nonterminating TM-resolution in Haskell type classes. We plan to continue looking for applications of this work in programming language design beyond logic programming.

Acknowledgements

Ekaterina Komendantskaya would like to acknowledge the support of EPSRC Grant EP/K031864/1-2. John Power would like to acknowledge the support of EPSRC grant EP/K028243/1 and Royal Society grant IE151369

Bibliography

References

[1] E. Komendantskaya, J. Power, M. Schmidt, Coalgebraic logic programming: from Semantics to Implementation, J. Log. Comput. 26 (2) (2016) 745 – 783.

[2] F. Bonchi, F. Zanasi, Bialgebraic Semantics for Logic Programming, Logical Methods in Computer Science 11 (1).

[3] G. Kelly, Basic concepts of enriched category theory, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series 64.

[4] G. Gupta, V. Costa, Optimal implementation of and-or parallel Prolog, in: PARLE'92, 71 – 92, 1994.

[5] R. Bruni, U. Montanari, F. Rossi, An interactive semantics of logic programming, TPLP 1 (6) (2001) 647 – 690.

[6] F. Bonchi, U. Montanari, Reactive systems, (semi-)saturated semantics and coalgebras on presheaves, Theor. Comput. Sci. 410 (41) (2009) 4044 – 4066.

[7] M. Comini, G. Levi, M. C. Meo, A Theory of Observables for Logic Programs, Inf. Comput. 169 (1) (2001) 23 – 80.

[8] J. Lloyd, Foundations of Logic Programming, Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[9] E. Komendantskaya, G. McCusker, J. Power, Coalgebraic semantics for parallel derivation strategies in logic programming, in: AMAST'2010, vol. 6486 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 111 – 127, 2011.

[10] E. Komendantskaya, M. Schmidt, J. Heras, Exploiting Parallelism in Coalgebraic Logic Programming, Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci. 303 (2014) 121 – 148.

[11] P. Johann, E. Komendantskaya, V. Komendantskiy, Structural Resolution for Logic Programming, in: Proceedings of the Technical Communications of the 31st International Conference on Logic Programming (ICLP 2015), Cork, Ireland, August 31 - September 4, 2015., vol. 1433 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, 2015.

[12] P. Fu, E. Komendantskaya, A Type-Theoretic Approach to Resolution, in: Logic-Based Program Synthesis and Transformation - 25th International Symposium, LOPSTR 2015, Siena, Italy, July 13-15, 2015. Revised Selected Papers, vol. 9527 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 91 – 106, 2015.

[13] P. Fu, E. Komendantskaya, T. Schrijvers, A. Pond, Proof Relevant Corecursive Resolution, in: Functional and Logic Programming - 13th International Symposium, FLOPS 2016, Kochi, Japan, March 4-6, 2016, Proceedings, vol. 9613 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 126 – 143, 2016.

[14] F. Bonchi, F. Zanasi, Saturated Semantics for Coalgebraic Logic Programming, in: Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science - 5th International Conference, CALCO 2013, Warsaw, Poland, September 3-6, 2013. Proceedings, vol. 8089 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 80 – 94, 2013.

[15] G. Amato, J. Lipton, R. McGrail, On the algebraic structure of declarative programming languages, Theor. Comput. Sci. 410 (46) (2009) 4626 – 4671.

[16] Y. Kinoshita, A. J. Power, A Fibrational Semantics for Logic Programs, in: Extensions of Logic Programming, 5th International Workshop, ELP'96, Leipzig, Germany, March 28-30, 1996, Proceedings, vol. 1050 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 177 – 191, 1996.

[17] E. Komendantskaya, J. Power, Coalgebraic Semantics for Derivations in Logic Programming, in: Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science - 4th International Conference, CALCO 2011, Winchester, UK, August 30 - September 2, 2011. Proceedings, vol. 6859 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 268 – 282, 2011.

[18] J. Benabou, Introduction to bicategories, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 47 (1967) 1 – 77.

[19] R. Blackwell, G. Kelly, A. Power, Two-dimensional monad theory, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 59 (1989) 1 – 41.

[20] G. Kelly, Coherence theorems for lax algebras and for distributive laws, in: Category seminar, vol. 420 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Spriniger, 281 – 375, 1974.

[21] J. He, C. A. R. Hoare, Categorical Semantics for Programming Languages, in: Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, 5th International Conference, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, March 29 - April 1, 1989, Proceedings, vol. 442 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 402 – 417, 1989.

[22] H. Jifeng, C. Hoare, Data refinement in a categorical setting, Tech. Rep. Technical Monograph PRG-90, Oxford University Computing Laboratory, Programming Research Group, Oxford, 1990.

[23] Y. Kinoshita, A. Power, Lax naturality through enrichment, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 112 (1996) 53 – 72.

[24] A. J. Power, An Algebraic Formulation for Data Refinement, in: Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, 5th International Conference, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, March 29 - April 1, 1989, Proceedings, vol. 442 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 390 – 401, 1989.

[25] E. Komendantskaya, J. Power, Category Theoretic Semantics for Theorem Proving in Logic Programming: Embracing the Laxness, in: Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science - 13th IFIP WG 1.3 International Workshop, CMCS 2016, Colocated with ETAPS 2016, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, April 2-3, 2016, Revised Selected Papers, vol. 9608 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 94 – 113, 2016.

[26] L. Sterling, E. Shapiro, The art of Prolog, MIT Press, 1986.

[27] E. Komendantskaya, J. Power, Coalgebraic Derivations in Logic Programming, in: Computer Science Logic, 25th International Workshop / 20th Annual Conference of the EACSL, CSL 2011, September 12-15, 2011, Bergen, Norway, Proceedings, vol. 12 of *LIPIcs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 352 – 366, 2011.

[28] G. D. Plotkin, J. Power, Notions of Computation Determine Monads, in: Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures, 5th International Conference, FOSSACS 2002. Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2002 Grenoble, France, April 8-12, 2002, Proceedings, vol. 2303 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 342 – 356, 2002.

[29] Terese, Term Rewriting Systems, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[30] L. Simon, A. Bansal, A. Mallya, G. Gupta, Co-Logic Programming: Extending Logic Programming with Coinduction, in: Automata, Languages and Programming, 34th International Colloquium, ICALP 2007, Wroclaw, Poland, July 9-13, 2007, Proceedings, vol. 4596 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 472 – 483, 2007.

[31] S. P. Jones, M. Jones, E. Meijer, Type classes: An exploration of the design space, in: Haskell Workshop, 1997.

[32] J. Worrell, Terminal sequences for accessible endofunctors, Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci. 19 (1999) 24 – 38.

[33] S. M. Lane, Categories for the Working Mathematician, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, 1971.

[34] I. Stark, Categorical Models for Local Names, Lisp and Symbolic Computation 9 (1) (1996) 77 – 107.

[35] M. Hyland, M. Nagayama, J. Power, G. Rosolini, A Category Theoretic Formulation for Engeler-style Models of the Untyped lambda, Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci. 161 (2006) 43 – 57.

[36] P. Johann, E. Komendantskaya, Structural Resolution: a Framework for Coinductive Proof Search and Proof Construction in Horn Clause Logic, Under Review, arXiv:1511.07865 .

[37] E. Komendantskaya, P. Johann, M. Schmidt, A productivity checker for logic programming, in: Accepted to pre-proceedings of LOPSTR'2016, arXiv:1608.04415, 2016.

[38] P. Fu, E. Komendantskaya, Operational semantics of resolution and productivity in Horn clause logic, Formal Aspects of Computing (2016) Accepted,ArXiv:1604.04114.

[39] F. Farka, E. Komendantskaya, K. Hammond, P. Fu, Coinductive Soundness of Corecursive Type Class Resolution, in: Accepted to pre-proceedings of LOPSTR'2016, arXiv:1608.05233, 2016.